arXiv:1502.05172v1 [math.AC] 18 Feb 2015

Covers and Envelopes of $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective modules

C. Selvaraj, A. Umamaheswaran, R. Udhayakumar
Department of Mathematics
Periyar University
Salem - 636 011, TN, India.
E-mail: selvavlr@yahoo.com

AMS Subject classification (2010): 16D10, 16D50, 16E30.

Abstract: In this paper, we investigate the notions of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $\mathcal{X}$-flat modules and give their characterizations, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of left R-modules. We prove the class of all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective modules is Kaplansky and show the existence of $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-covers and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-envelopes over a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring R. Moreover, we prove that decomposition of a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module into a projective and a coreduced $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module over a self $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Finally, we prove that every module has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective cover over a Noetherian ring R, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all pure projective modules.

Keywords: $\mathcal{X}$-injective module, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module, $\mathcal{X}$-injective cover, Kaplansky class.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R denotes an associative ring with identity and all R-modules, if not specified otherwise, left R-modules. R-Mod denotes the category of left R-modules.

The notion of FP-injective modules over arbitrary rings was first introduced by Stenström in [22]. An R-module M is called FP-injective if $Ext^1_R(N, M) = 0$ for all finitely presented R-modules N. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a class of left R-modules. Mao and Ding in [16] introduced the concept of $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules (see Definition 3.1).

The notions of (pre)covers and (pre)envelopes of modules were introduced by Enochs in [8] and, independently, by Auslander and Smalø in [2]. Since then the existence and the properties of (pre)covers and (pre)envelopes relative to certain submodule categories have been studied widely. The theory of (pre)covers and (pre)envelopes, which play an important role in homological algebra and representation theory of algebras, becomes now one of the main research topics in relative homological algebra.

Salce introduced the notion of a cotorsion theory in [21]. Enochs showed the important fact that closed and complete cotorsion pairs provide minimal versions of covers and envelopes. Eklof and Trlifaj [7] proved that a cotorsion pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is complete when it is cogenerated by a set. Consequently, many classical cotorsion pairs are complete. In this way, Enochs et al. [3] showed that every module has a flat cover over an arbitrary ring. These motivate us to prove the existence of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective cover and $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope. In particular, we prove the following result.

Theorem A. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Then every R-module M has a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective cover and an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope.*

Self injective rings were introduced by Johnson and Wong in [14]. A ring R is said to be self injective if R over itself is an injective module. In this paper, we introduce self $\mathcal{X}$-injective ring (see Definition 4.15). Mao and Ding [17] proved that an FI-injective R-module decomposes into an injective and a reduced FI-injective R-module over a coherent ring. Similarly, we can prove the following result:

Theorem B. *Let R be a self $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Then an R-module M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective if and only if M is a direct sum of a projective R-module and a coreduced $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective R-module.*

Enochs and Pinzon [18] proved that every module has an FP-injective cover over a coherent ring. We prove the following result that provides the existence of $\mathcal{X}$-injective cover, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all pure projective modules.

Theorem C. *Let R be a Noetherian ring. Then every R-module M has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective cover.*

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall some notions that are necessary for our proofs of the main results of this paper.

In Section 3, we investigate the notions of $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $\mathcal{X}$-flat modules and give their characterizations.

In Section 4, we introduce $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Further, we investigate $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module and give its characterizations. Further, we prove the main results which are Theorem A and Theorem B.

In Section 5, we prove that if M is a submodule of an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module A, then $i\colon M \to A$ is a special $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M if and only if A is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective essential extension of M.

In the last section, we assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all pure projective modules and we prove that every module has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope. Moreover, we prove the main result of this section is Theorem C.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall some known definitions and terminologies that will be used in the rest of the paper.

Given a class $\mathscr{C}$ of left R-modules, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{C}^{\perp} &= \big\{N \in R\text{-}Mod \mid Ext^1_R(M,N)=0,\ \forall\, M \in \mathscr{C}\big\} \\ {}^{\perp}\mathscr{C} &= \big\{N \in R\text{-}Mod \mid Ext^1_R(N,M)=0,\ \forall\, M \in \mathscr{C}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Following [8], we say that a map $f \in Hom_R(C,M)$ with $C \in \mathscr{C}$ is a $\mathscr{C}$-precover of M, if the group homomorphism $Hom_R(C',f) : Hom_R(C',C) \to Hom_R(C',M)$ is surjective for each $C' \in \mathscr{C}$. A $\mathscr{C}$-precover $f \in Hom_R(C,M)$ of M is called a $\mathscr{C}$-cover of M if f is right minimal. That is, if $fg = f$ implies that g is an automorphism for each $g \in End_R(C)$. $\mathscr{C} \subseteq R - Mod$ is a precovering class (resp. covering class) provided that each module has a $\mathscr{C}$-precover (resp. $\mathscr{C}$-cover). Dually, we have the definition of $\mathscr{C}$ preenvelope (resp. $\mathscr{C}$ envelope).

A $\mathscr{C}$-precover f of M is said to be *special* [13] if f is an epimorphism and $kerf \in \mathscr{C}^{\perp}$.

A $\mathscr{C}$-preenvelope f of M is said to be *special* [13] if f is a monomorphism and $cokerf \in {}^{\perp}\mathscr{C}$.

A $\mathscr{C}$-envelope $\phi\colon M \to C$ is said to have the *unique mapping property* [6] if for any homomorphism $f\colon M \to C'$ with $C' \in \mathscr{C}$, there is a unique homomorphism $g\colon C \to C'$ such that $g\phi = f$.

Recall that an R-module M is called *reduced* [9] if it has no nonzero injective submodules. An R-module M is said to be *coreduced* [5] if it has no nonzero projective quotient modules.

A module is said to be *pure projective* [19] if it is projective with respect to pure exact sequence.

A class $\mathscr{C}$ of left R-modules is said to be *injectively resolving* [13] if $\mathscr{C}$ contains all injective modules and if given an exact sequence of left R-modules

$$0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$$

$C \in \mathscr{C}$ whenever $A, B \in \mathscr{C}$.

Definition 2.1. (1) *A pair $\mathfrak{C} = (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ of classes of modules is called a cotorsion*[13] *if $\mathcal{A} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}^{\perp}$.*

(2) *A cotorsion theory $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is said to be perfect* [10] *if every module has an $\mathcal{A}$-cover and a $\mathcal{B}$-envelope.*

For an R-module M, $fd(M)$ denote the flat dimension of M and $id(M)$ denote the injective dimension of M. The $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-coresolution dimension of M, denoted by $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M)$, is defined to be the smallest nonnegative integer n such that $Ext_R^{n+1}(A, M) = 0$ for all R-modules $A \in \mathcal{X}$ (if no such n exists, set $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M) = \infty$), and $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(R)$ is defined as $\sup\{cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M) | M \in R\text{-}Mod\}$.

We denote by $\mathbb{Z}$ the ring of all integers, and by $\mathbb{Q}$ the field of all rational numbers. For a left R-module M, we denote by $M^+ = Hom_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ the *character module* of M. $\mathcal{I}_0$ denotes the class of all injective left R-modules. Also, we denote by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ the class of all $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules (that is, $\mathcal{X}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ the class of all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective R-modules (that is, $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} = {}^{\perp}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$).

For unexplained terminology we refer to [1, 20].

3. $\mathcal{X}$-INJECTIVE AND $\mathcal{X}$-FLAT MODULES

We begin with the following definition

Definition 3.1. [16] *A left R-module M is called $\mathcal{X}$-injective if $Ext_R^1(X, M) = 0$ for all left R-modules $X \in \mathcal{X}$. A right R-module N is said to be $\mathcal{X}$-flat if $Tor_1^R(N, X) = 0$ for all left R-modules $X \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Remark 3.2. *It is clear that the class of all injective modules lies between the class of all $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules and the class of all flat module lies between the class of all $\mathcal{X}$-flat modules.*

Proposition 3.3. *Let M be an R-module. Then the following are true.*

(1) *M is injective if and only if M is $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $id(M) \leq 1$.*
(2) *M is injective if and only if M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective and $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M) \leq 1$.*

Proof. (1). The direct implication is clear. Conversely, let M be $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $id(M) \leq 1$. For any R-module N, consider an exact sequence $0 \to N \to E(N) \to L \to 0$ with $E(N)$ an injective envelope of N. We have an exact sequence $\cdots \to Ext_R^1(E(N), M) \to Ext_R^1(N, M) \to Ext_R^2(N, M) \to \cdots$. Since $id(M) \leq 1$, $Ext_R^2(N, M) = 0$ and hence M is injective.

(2). The direct implication is clear by the definition of an injective module. Conversely, let M be $\mathcal{X}$-injective and $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M) \leq 1$. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to M \to E(M) \to L \to 0$ with $E(M)$ an injective envelope of M. For any R-module $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we have an exact sequence $\cdots \to Ext_R^1(X, E(M)) \to Ext_R^1(X, L) \to Ext_R^2(X, M) \to \cdots$. Since $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(M) \leq 1$, $Ext_R^2(X, M) = 0$ and hence L is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Therefore, $Ext_R^1(L, M) = 0$, so that the exact sequence is split. It follows that M is a direct summand of E, as desired. $\square$

We now give some of the characterizations of $\mathcal{X}$-injective module:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{I}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The following are equivalent for a left R-module M :*

(1) *M is $\mathcal{X}$-injective;*
(2) *For every exact sequence $0 \to M \to E \to L \to 0$, with $E \in \mathcal{X}$, $E \to L$ $\mathcal{X}$-precover of L;*

(3) *M is a kernel of an $\mathcal{X}$-precover $f\colon A \to B$ with A an injective module;*
(4) *M is injective with respect to every exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$, with $C \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Consider an exact sequence

$$0 \to M \to E \to L \to 0,$$

where $E \in \mathcal{X}$. Then by hypothesis $Hom_R(E', E) \to Hom_R(E', L)$ is surjective for all left R-modules $E' \in \mathcal{X}$, as desired.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \to M \to E(M) \xrightarrow{f} E(M)/M \to 0.$$

Clearly, $E(M) \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, by hypothesis it follows that $f\colon E(M) \to E(M)/M$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-precover of $E(M)/M$. Hence $E(M)/\ker f \cong E(M)/M$, and so $M = \ker f$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let M be a kernel of an $\mathcal{X}$-precover $f\colon A \to B$ with A an injective module. Then we have an exact sequence $0 \to M \to A \to A/M \to 0$. Therefore, for any left R-module $N \in \mathcal{X}$, the sequence $Hom_R(N, A) \to Hom_R(N, A/M) \to Ext^1_R(N, M) \to 0$ is exact. By hypothesis, $Hom_R(N, A) \to Hom_R(N, A/M)$ is surjective. Thus $Ext^1_R(N, M) = 0$, and hence (1) follows.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4). Consider an exact sequence

$$0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0,$$

where $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Then $Hom_R(B, M) \to Hom_R(A, M)$ is surjective, as desired.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1). For each left R-module $N \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a short exact sequence $0 \to K \to P \to N \to 0$ with P a projective module, which induces an exact sequence $Hom_R(P, M) \to Hom_R(K, M) \to Ext^1_R(N, M) \to 0$. By hypothesis, $Hom_R(P, M) \to Hom_R(K, M) \to 0$ is exact. Thus $Ext^1_R(N, M) = 0$, and hence (1) follows. ☐

Example 3.5. *Let $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})^{\perp} = \widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ and let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a commutative Noetherian and complete local domain. Assume that the depth$R \geq 2$ and cores.dim$_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(R) \leq 1$. Then $R/\mathfrak{m} \oplus E(R)$ is an $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective module.*

Proof. Consider the residue field $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$ and an exact sequence $0 \to k \to E(k) \xrightarrow{\phi} E(k)/k \to 0$. For any $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective R-module G, the sequence $Hom_R(G, E(k)) \to Hom_R(G, E(k)/k) \to Ext^1_R(G, k) \to 0$ is exact. By [24, p 43], ϕ is an injective cover of $E(k)/k$. Clearly, ϕ is an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective cover of $E(k)/k$. Thus $Hom_R(G, E(k)) \to Hom_R(G, E(k)/k)$ is surjective. So $Ext^1_R(G, k) = 0$, and hence k is $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective. By Proposition 3.4, k is $\ker \phi$. Now, let K be an injective submodule of k. Suppose $E(k) = K \oplus L$, $p\colon E(k) \to L$ is a projection and $i\colon L \to E(k)$ is an inclusion. Since $\phi(K) = 0$, $\phi(ip) = \phi$. This implies that ip is an isomorphism as ϕ is an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective cover. Thus i is an epimorphism, and hence $E(k) = L$, $K = 0$. So $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$ is reduced $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective.

Since R is domain, the quotient field $Q(R)$ of a ring R is injective, and $Q(R)$ is essential over R. Hence $E(R) = Q(R)$. Now $k \oplus E(R)$ with $E(R)$ an injective R-module and k a reduced $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective R-module. Since finite direct sum of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective R modules is $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective, $k \oplus E(R)$ is $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective. ☐

Example 3.6. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a commutative Noetherian and complete local ring. Assume that the depth$R \leq 1$. Then the residue field $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$ is not $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective.*

Proof. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to k \to E(k) \xrightarrow{\phi} E(k)/k \to 0$. Hence by [9, Corollary 5.4.7], ϕ is not an injective cover of $E(k)/k$. This implies that ϕ is not an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective cover of $E(k)/k$. Then by Proposition 3.4, k is not $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-injective. $\square$

We now give some characterizations of $\mathcal{X}$-flat module:

Proposition 3.7. *The following are equivalent for a right R-module M:*

1. *M is $\mathcal{X}$-flat;*
2. *For every exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ with $C \in \mathcal{X}$, the functor $M \otimes_R -$ preserves the exactness;*
3. *$Ext^1_R(M, G^+) = 0$ for all $G \in \mathcal{X}$;*
4. *M^+ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Consider an exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ with $C \in \mathcal{X}$. Since M is $\mathcal{X}$-flat, $Tor^R_1(M, C) = 0$. Hence the functor $M \otimes -$ preserves the exactness.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $G \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a short sequence $0 \to K \to F \to G \to 0$ with F a projective module, which induces an exact sequence $0 \to Tor^R_1(M, G) \to M \otimes K \to M \otimes F \to M \otimes G \to 0$. By hypothesis, $Tor^R_1(M, G) = 0$. Thus M is $\mathcal{X}$-flat.

(1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3). It follows from the natural isomorphism [12, p 34] $Tor^R_1(M, G)^+ \cong Ext^1_R(M, G^+)$.

(1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4). It follows from the natural isomorphism [4, VI 5.1] $Ext^1_R(G, M^+) \cong Tor^R_1(M, G)^+$. $\square$

Proposition 3.8. *Let R be a coherent ring. Then a right R-module N is flat if and only if N is $\mathcal{X}$-flat and $fd(N) \leq 1$.*

Proof. "only if" part is trivial. Conversely, suppose that N is $\mathcal{X}$-flat. By Remark 3.7, N^+ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. By [11, Theorem 2.1], $fd(N) = id(N^+)$. Then $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(N^+) \leq 1$ since $cores.dim_{\mathcal{X}}(N^+) \leq id(N^+)$. By Proposition 3.3, N^+ is injective and hence N is flat. $\square$

4. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-PROJECTIVE COVER AND $\mathcal{X}$-INJECTIVE ENVELOPE

Now, we introduce $\mathcal{X}$-projective module.

Definition 4.1. *An R-module M is called a $\mathcal{X}$-projective if $Ext^1_R(M, X) = 0$ for all R-modules $X \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Remark 4.2. *Every projective module is $\mathcal{X}$-projective. The converse is need not be true.*

Example 4.3. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a complete local ring and $(\mathcal{X}^{\perp})^{\perp} = \widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$. Assume that the $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(R) \leq 1$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(k)/k$ is $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-projective, where $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$ is the residue field and $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(k)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective envelope of k.*

Proof. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to k \xrightarrow{\psi} E(k) \to E(k)/k \to 0$, where ψ is an injective envelope of k. Since $cores.dim_{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(R) \leq 1$, $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(k) = E(k)$ and hence ψ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective envelope of k. Since the class of all $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-projective modules is closed under extensions, then by [24, Lemma 2.1.2] $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}(k)/k = E(k)/k$ is $\widehat{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-projective. $\square$

We now introduce the following definition

Definition 4.4. *A ring R is called a left $\mathcal{X}$-hereditary if every left ideal of R is $\mathcal{X}$-projective.*

Example 4.5. *Semisimple ring, Dedekind domain and hereditary ring.*

Remark 4.6. *Every hereditary ring is $\mathcal{X}$-hereditary. The converse is need not be true since every $\mathcal{X}$-projective is not necessarily projective.*

Given a class $\mathcal{X}$ of left R-modules, we write $\mathcal{X}^{\perp_2} = \{N \in R\text{–}Mod \mid Ext^2_R(X, N) = 0, \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

Example 4.7. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp_2} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$, where $\mathcal{X} = \{R/\mathfrak{p} \colon \mathfrak{p} \in SpecR\}$. Then R is an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-hereditary ring.*

Proof. Let I be an ideal of R. We claim that I is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-projective. By hypothesis, $Ext^2_R(R/\mathfrak{p}, G) = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in SpecR$ and for all $G \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$. It follows that $id(G) \leq 1$. Thus $Ext^2_R(R/I, G) = 0$ for all ideals I of R and for all $G \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to I \to R \to R/I \to 0$. So $Ext^1_R(I, G) = 0$ for all $G \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$. Hence I is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-projective, as desired. □

Note that an R-module M is called a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective if $Ext^1_R(M, U) = 0$ for all R-modules $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Clearly, $(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}, \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is a cotorsion theory. A ring R is called a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary if every ideal of R is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective.

Proposition 4.8. *A ring R is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary if and only if every submodule of a ($\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-)projective R-module is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective.*

Proof. Let I be an ideal of R. Then there is an exact sequence $0 \to I \to R \to R/I \to 0$. By hypothesis, $Ext^2_R(R/I, U) = 0$ for any $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module U. Thus $id(U) \leq 1$. Let G be a submodule of an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module H. Then, for any $\mathcal{X}$-injective module U, the sequence $\cdots \to Ext^1_R(H, U) \to Ext^1_R(G, U) \to Ext^2_R(H/G, U) \to \cdots$ is exact. Thus $Ext^1_R(G, U) = 0$ since H is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective and $id(U) \leq 1$. The reverse implication is clear. □

Example 4.9. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring and $\mathcal{X}^{\perp_2} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$, where $\mathcal{X} = \{R/\mathfrak{p} \colon \mathfrak{p} \in SpecR\}$. Let $S = \mathbb{M}_n(R)$. Then S is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-hereditary ring.*

Proof. By Example 4.7, R is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-hereditary. For $S = \mathbb{M}_n(R)$, the module categories ${}_R\mathfrak{C}$ and ${}_S\mathfrak{D}$ are equivalent by [15, Theorem 17.20]. From this natural eqivalance, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$ projective S-modules M correspond to $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$ projective R-modules N. Hence submodules of M correspond to submodules of N. By Proposition 4.8, all submodules of N are $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$ projective in ${}_R\mathfrak{C}$. It follows that submodules of M are $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-projective in ${}_S\mathfrak{D}$. This implies that S is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}_2}$-hereditary ring by Proposition 4.8. □

In general, the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ of all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective modules is not necessarily closed under pure submodules. If R is a hereditary ring, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} = R\text{-}Mod$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{I}_0$. It follows that $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is closed under pure submodules. If R is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary, then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is need not be equal to $\mathcal{I}_0$. Is it true that $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ a closed under pure submodules over a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring? We have the following

Proposition 4.10. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Then the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is closed under pure submodules.*

Proof. Let A be a pure submodule of a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module H. Then we have to claim that A is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to A \to H \to H/A \to 0$. Then the following pullback diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
& & K \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & K \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & X \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & P \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & A \arrow[r] & H \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & H/A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
& & 0 & 0, &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where P is projective. By Proposition 4.8, K is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Also X is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective since $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is closed under extensions. In the middle row of the above diagram, the sequence $\cdots \to Ext^1_R(X,G) \to Ext^1_R(A,G) \to Ext^2_R(P,G) \to \cdots$ is exact for any $\mathcal{X}$-injective module G. It follows that $Ext^1_R(A,G) = 0$. Therefore A is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. ☐

Definition 4.11. [10] *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a class of R-modules. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is said to be Kaplansky class if there exists a cardinal $\aleph$ such that for every $M \in \mathcal{K}$ and for each $x \in M$, there exists a submodule K of M such that $x \in K \subseteq M, K, M/K \in \mathcal{K}$ and $Card(K) \leq \aleph$.*

The following result is analog of Proposition 2.6 in [10].

Proposition 4.12. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is Kaplansky.*

Proof. Let $M \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ and $x \in M$. Then there exists an exact sequence in R-Mod

$$\mathbb{P}_\bullet = \cdots \to P_2 \overset{p_2}{\to} P_1 \overset{p_1}{\to} P_0 \overset{p^0}{\to} P^0 \overset{p^1}{\to} P^1 \overset{p^2}{\to} \cdots$$

where P^i's and P_i's are projective R-modules and such that $M = \ker(P^0 \to P^1)$. The complex $\mathbb{P}_\bullet$ is a complete projective resolution of M. Since every projective module is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, then P_i's and P^i's are $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. It follows that the complex $\mathbb{P}_\bullet$ is a complete $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective resolution of M. We will construct a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective submodule F of M with $x \in F$.

Since $x \in M$, there exists $y \in P_0$ such that $f(y) = x$ by surjectivity of f, where $f\colon P_0 \to M$. Consider $< y > \subseteq P_0$ and we get the inclusion map $< y > \to P_0$. By Remark [9, Lemma 5.3.12], a cardinal $\aleph_0$ and a submodule $F_0 \subseteq P_0$ pure such that $< y > \subseteq F_0$ and $Card(F_0) \leq \aleph_0$. Let $f(F_0) \subseteq M$ and observe that $f(F_0) \subseteq P^0$. As before we obtain $F^0 \subseteq P^0$ pure and a cardinal $\aleph_1$ such that $Card(F^0) \leq \aleph_1$. Then consider the quotient $F^0/f(F_0)$ and get $F^1 \subseteq P^1$ and $\aleph_2$ such that $Card(F^1) \leq \aleph_2$.

Now we reverse the process in the opposite direction and consider $F^0 \cap P^0/M$. Then there exists a submodule D^0 of P^0 which applies in $F^0 \cap P^0/M$. We get again $F^0_1 \subseteq P^0$ pure and $\aleph_3$ such that $D^0 \subseteq F^0_1$ and $Card(F^0_1) \leq \aleph_3$. Let $p^0(F^0_1)$ and obtain $F^1_1 \subseteq P^1$ pure and $\aleph_4$ such that $p^0(F^0_1) \subseteq F^1_1$ and $Card(F^1_1) \leq \aleph_4$. Now let $F^0_1 \cap M$. Since f is surjective, there exists $D_0 \subseteq P_0$ which applies in the preceding module. Let $f(D_0) \subseteq M$ and $D_1 \subseteq P_1$ which applies in $f(D_0)$. We obtain $F^1_1 \subset P_1$ pure and $\aleph_5$ such that $D_1 \subseteq F^1_1$ and $Card(F^1_1) \leq \aleph_5$.

Again we start the construction going forward and we consider $p_1(F^1_1) \subseteq P_0$ and proceed as before, going n steps forward, going back $n+1$ steps and $n+2$ forward again. Then we take the union of all the complexes constructed in the "zig-zag" process

$$\mathbb{F}_\bullet = \cdots \to F_1 \to F_0 \to F^0 \to F^1 \to \cdots$$

and we consider $F = \ker(F^0 \to F^1)$, which is a submodule of M which contains the element x and that by the construction, there exists a cardinal $\aleph$ such that $Card(F) \leq \aleph$. The complex $\mathbb{F}_\bullet$ is exact by its construction. Since F^i's and F_i's are pure submodules of $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective module, then by Proposition 4.10 these modules are $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective.

Finally, M/F is also $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective since the quotient complex $\mathbb{P}_\bullet/\mathbb{F}_\bullet$ is exact. □

Proposition 4.13. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-hereditary ring. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under direct limits.*

Proof. Let $(M_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in \Lambda)$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective modules over a directed index set Λ and canonical maps $\psi_\alpha \colon M_\alpha \to M (= \varinjlim_{\alpha\in\Lambda} M_\alpha)$. For every $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module G, there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \to G \to E \xrightarrow{f} L \to 0 \tag{1}$$

with E an injective module, which induces an exact sequence $Hom_R(M,E) \to Hom_R(M,L) \to Ext^1_R(M,G) \to 0$. We show that M is $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective. It is enough to show that $Hom_R(M,E) \to Hom_R(M,L)$ is surjective. Let $\gamma \in Hom_R(M,L)$. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to I \to R \to R/I \to 0$, which induces an exact sequence $\cdots \to Ext^1_R(I,G) \to Ext^2_R(R/I,G) \to Ext^2_R(R,G) \to \cdots$. Since R is $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-hereditary, $Ext^2_R(R/I,G) = 0$. Thus $id(G) \leq 1$. From (1), we get an exact sequence $\cdots \to Ext^1_R(N,E) \to Ext^1_R(N,L) \to Ext^2_R(N,G) \to \cdots$ for any $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective R-module N. It follows that $Ext^1_R(N,L) = 0$, i.e., $L \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$. Thus L is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Hence γ factors through some M_α. Then there is a map $\overline{\psi_\alpha} \in Hom_R(M, M_\alpha)$ such that $\gamma = \gamma_\alpha\overline{\psi_\alpha}$, where $\gamma_\alpha \in Hom_R(M_\alpha, L)$. Since $Ext^1_R(M_\alpha, G) = 0$, $Hom_R(M_\alpha, E) \to Hom_R(M_\alpha, L)$ is surjective. Then there exists $\overline{\gamma} \in Hom_R(M_\alpha, E)$ such that $f\overline{\gamma_\alpha} = \gamma_\alpha$. Thus $\gamma = (f\overline{\gamma_\alpha})\overline{\psi_\alpha} = f(\overline{\gamma_\alpha}\overline{\psi_\alpha})$. $\overline{\gamma_\alpha}\overline{\psi_\alpha}$ is required preimage of γ. □

Theorem 4.14. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-hereditary ring. Then every R-module M has a $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective cover and an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.12, $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$ is a Kaplansky class. Since all projective modules are $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective, $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$ contains the projective modules. Clearly, $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under extensions. By Proposition 4.13, $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under direct limits. Then by [10, Theorem 2.9], $(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X})$ is a perfect cotorsion theory. Hence by Definition 2.1, every module has a $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}}$-cover and a $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-envelope. □

Now we introduce self $\mathcal{X}$-injective ring.

Definition 4.15. *A ring R is said to be self $\mathcal{X}$-injective if R over itself is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module.*

Example 4.16. *QF-ring and self injective ring.*

We now give some characterizations of $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective module:

Proposition 4.17. *Let R be a self $\mathcal{X}$-injective ring and let M be an R-module. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M is $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$-projective;*
2. *M is projective with respect to every exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$, with A an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module;*

(3) *For every exact sequence* $0 \to K \to P \to M \to 0$*, where* P *is* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective,* $K \to P$ *is an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective preenvelope of* K;

(4) M *is cokernel of an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective preenvelope* $K \to P$ *with* P *a projective module.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Let $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ be an exact sequence, where A is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then by hypothesis $Hom_R(M,B) \to Hom_R(M,C)$ is surjective.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let N be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module. Then there is a sequence $0 \to N \to E \to L \to 0$ with E an injective envelope of N. By (2), $Hom_R(M,E) \to Hom_R(M,L)$ is surjective. Thus $Ext^1_R(M,N) = 0$, as desired.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Clearly, $Ext^1_R(M,F') = 0$ for all $\mathcal{X}$-injective F'. Hence we have an exact sequence $Hom_R(F,F') \to Hom_R(K,F') \to 0$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4). Consider an exact sequence $0 \to K \to P \to M \to 0$ where P projective. Since R is self $\mathcal{X}$-injective, every projective module is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Hence P is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Then by hypothesis $K \to P$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By hypothesis, there is an exact sequence $0 \to K \to P \to M \to 0$, where $K \to P$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope with P projective. It gives rise to the exactness of $Hom_R(P,N) \to Hom_R(K,N) \to Ext^1_R(M,N) \to 0$ for each $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module N. Since R is self $\mathcal{X}$-injective, $Hom_R(P,N) \to Hom_R(K,N)$ is surjective. Hence $Ext^1_R(M,N) = 0$, as desired. □

Proposition 4.18. *Let* R *be a self* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective and* $\mathcal{U_X}$*-hereditary ring. Then the following are equivalent for an* R*-module* M*:*

(1) M *is coreduced* $\mathcal{U_X}$*-projective;*

(2) M *is a cokernel of an* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective envelope* $K \to P$ *with* P *a projective module.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Consider an exact sequence $0 \to K \xrightarrow{f} P \xrightarrow{g} M \to 0$ with P a projective module. Since R is self $\mathcal{X}$-injective, P is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. By Proposition 4.17, the natural map $f\colon K \to P$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope of K. By Proposition 4.14, K has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope $\alpha\colon K \to P^{'}$. Then there exist $\beta\colon P^{'} \to P$ and $\beta^{'}\colon P \to P^{'}$ such that $\alpha = \beta^{'} f$ and $f = \beta\alpha$. Hence $\alpha = (\beta\beta^{'})\alpha$. It follows that $\beta\beta^{'}$ is an isomorphism, $P = \mathrm{im}(\beta) \oplus \ker(\beta^{'})$. Note that $\mathrm{im}(f) \subseteq \mathrm{im}(\beta)$, and so $P/\mathrm{im}(f) \to P/\mathrm{im}(\beta) \to 0$ is exact. But M is coreduced and $P/\mathrm{im}(f) \cong M$, and hence $P/\mathrm{im}(\beta) = 0$, that is, $P = \mathrm{im}(\beta)$. So β is an isomorphism, and hence $f\colon K \to P$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of K.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By Proposition 4.17, M is $\mathcal{U_X}$-projective and M is coreduced by [6, Lemma 3.7] □

We are now to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.19. *Let* R *be a self* $\mathcal{X}$*-injective and* $\mathcal{U_X}$*-hereditary ring. Then an* R*-module* M *is* $\mathcal{U_X}$*-projective if and only if* M *is a direct sum of a projective* R*-module and a coreduced* $\mathcal{U_X}$*-projective* R*-module.*

Proof. "If" part is clear.

"Only if" part. Let M be a $\mathcal{U_X}$-projective R-module. By Proposition 4.17, we have an exact sequence $0 \to K \to P \to M \to 0$ with P a projective module, where $K \to P$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope of K . By Proposition 4.14, K has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope $f \in Hom_R(K,P^{'})$ with P' an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module. Then we have the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & P^{'} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\alpha"] & P^{'}/\operatorname{im} f \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\phi"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & P \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r, "f"] & P^{'} \arrow[r] & P^{'}/\operatorname{im} f \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that $\beta\alpha$ is an isomorphism, and so $P = \ker\beta \oplus \operatorname{im}\alpha$. Since $\operatorname{im}\alpha \cong P^{'}$, $P^{'}$ and $\ker\beta$ are projective. Therefore $P^{'}/\operatorname{im} f$ is a coreduced $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module by Proposition 4.18. By the Five Lemma, $\sigma\phi$ is an isomorphism. Hence, we have $M = \operatorname{im}\phi \oplus \ker\sigma$, where $\operatorname{im}\phi \cong P^{'}/\operatorname{im} f$. In addition, we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & 0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \ker\beta \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \ker\sigma \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & P \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta"] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\sigma"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & P^{'}/\operatorname{im} f \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0. &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Hence, $\ker\sigma \cong \ker\beta$. ☐

5. Some Relation Between $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective and $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules

In this section, we deals with $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of a module and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\phi : M \to A$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope. Then $L = A/\phi(M)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective and hence A is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective whenever M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective.*

Proof. It follows from [24, Lemma 2.1.2]. ☐

Theorem 5.2. *Let $0 \to M \to A \to D \to 0$ be a minimal generator of all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extensions of M. Then A is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M.*

Proof. It follows from [24, Theorem 2.2.1]. ☐

Let M be a submodule of a module A. Then A is called a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extension of a submodule M if A/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective.

Recall that among all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extensions of M we call one of them $0 \to M \to A \to D \to 0$ a generator for $\mathcal{E}xt\Big(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}, M\Big)$ (or a generator for all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extensions of M) if for any $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extension $0 \to M \to A' \to D' \to 0$ of M, then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & A' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & D' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] & A \arrow[r] & D \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Furthermore, a generator $0 \to M \to A \to D \to 0$ is called minimal if for all the vertical maps are isomorphisms whenever A', D' are replaced by A, D, respectively.

Theorem 5.3. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring. Then for an R-module M, there must be a minimal generator whenever $\mathcal{E}xt\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}, M\right)$ has a generator.*

Proof. It follows from [24, Theorem 2.2.2]. ☐

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that an R-module M has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope. Let M be a submodule of an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module L. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$i\colon M \to L$ is a special $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope;*

(2) *L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, and there are no direct summands L_1 of L with $L_1 \neq L$ and $M \subseteq L_1$;*

(3) *L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, and for any epimorphism $\alpha\colon L/M \to N$ such that $\alpha\pi$ is split, $N = 0$, where $\pi\colon L \to L/M$ is the canonical map;*

(4) *L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, and any endomorphism γ of L such that $\gamma i = i$ is a monomorphism;*

(5) *L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, and there is no nonzero submodule N of L such that $M \cap N = 0$ and $L = (M \oplus N)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective.*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) follows from [24, Corollary 1.2.3] and Theorem 5.1.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Since $\alpha\pi$ is split, there is a monomorphism $\beta : N \to L$ such that $L = \ker(\alpha\pi) \oplus \beta(N)$. Note that $M \subseteq \ker(\alpha\pi)$, and so $L = \ker(\alpha\pi)$ by (2). Thus $\beta(N) = 0$, and hence $N = 0$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2). If $L = L_1 \oplus N$ with $M \subseteq L_1$. Let $p\colon L \to N$ be a canonical projection. Then there is an epimorphism $\alpha\colon L/M \to N$ such that $\alpha\pi = p$. Thus $N = 0$ by hypothsis, and hence $L = L_1$, as required.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4). By Wakamatsu's Lemma [9, Proposition 7.2.4], L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Since $\gamma i = i$ and i is monomorphism, γ is monomorphism.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Since L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, i is a special $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope. Let $\psi\colon M \to \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M. Then there exist $\mu\colon L \to \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ and $\nu\colon \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \to L$ such that $\mu i = \psi$ and $\nu\psi = i$. Hence $\mu\nu\psi = \psi$ and $i = \nu\mu i$. Thus $\mu\nu$ is an isomorphism, and so μ is epic. In addition, by (4), $\nu\mu$ is monic, and hence μ is monic. Therefore μ is an isomorphism, and hence i is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (5). It is obvious that L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Suppose there is a nonzero submodule $N \subseteq L$ such that $M \cap N = 0$ and $L = (M \oplus N)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Let $\pi\colon L \to L/N$ be a canonical map. Since $L/(N \oplus M)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective and L is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, there is a $\beta\colon L/N \to L$ such that the following diagram with row exact

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & L \arrow[d, "\pi"] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[ur, "i"] \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, "i"] & L/N \arrow[r] \arrow[dl, "\beta"] & L/(N \oplus M) \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & L & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Hence $\beta\pi i = i$. Note that i is an envelope, and so $\beta\pi$ is an isomorphism, whence π is an isomorphism. But this is impossible since $\pi(N) = 0$.

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $\psi_M \colon M \to \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M. Since L/M is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective, i is a special $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope. Thus we have the following commutative diagram with an exact row.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r, "\psi_M"] \arrow[dr, "i"] & \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \arrow[r, "\phi"] \arrow[d, shift left, "f"] & Q \arrow[r] & 0 \\
& & L \arrow[u, shift left, "g"] \arrow[ur, "\alpha"'] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

i.e., $f\psi_M = i$, $gi = \psi_M$. So $gf\psi_M = \psi_M$. Note that ψ_M is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope, and hence gf is an isomorphism. Without loss of generality, we may assume $gf = 1$. Write $\alpha = \phi g \colon L \to Q$. It is clear that α is epic and $M \cap \ker(g) = 0$. We show that $M \oplus \ker(g) = \ker(\alpha)$. Clearly, $M \oplus \ker(g) \subseteq \ker(\alpha)$. Let $x \in \ker(\alpha)$. Then $\alpha(x) = \phi g(x) = 0$. It follows that $g(x) = \psi_M(m)$ for some $m \in M$, and hence $fg(x) = f\psi_M(m) = m, g(x) = gfg(x) = g(m)$. Thus $x \in M \oplus \ker(g)$, and so $\ker(\alpha) \subseteq M \oplus \ker(g)$, as desired. Consequently, $L = (M \oplus \ker(g)) = L/\ker(\alpha) \cong Q$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective by Wakamatsu's Lemma. Thus $\ker(g) = 0$ by hypothesis, and hence g is an isomorphism. So $i \colon M \to L$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope. $\square$

A submodule of $\mathcal{X}$-injective module need not be $\mathcal{X}$-injective.

Example 5.5. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a commutative Noetherian and local domain. Assume that $depthR \leq 1$. Then the submodule k of injective envelope $E(k)$ of k is not $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*

Proof. Consider an exact sequence $0 \to k \to E(k) \overset{\phi}{\to} E(k)/k \to 0$. Hence by [9, Corollary 5.4.7], ϕ is not an injective cover of $E(k)/k$. This implies that ϕ is not an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-injective cover of $E(k)/k$. Then by Proposition 3.4, k is not $\mathcal{X}$-injective. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. *Let R be a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-hereditary ring and let M be any submodule of an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module A. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$i \colon M \to A$ is a special $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M;*
(2) *A is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective essential extension of M.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). It follows by Proposition 5.4.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By hypothesis, we have an exact sequence: $0 \to M \to A \to L \to 0$ with A an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module and D an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective module. This sequence is a generator of all $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extensions of M. By Theorem 5.3 and 5.2, we have an $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective extension sequence of M $0 \to M \to A' \to L' \to 0$ which gives an $\mathcal{X}$-injective envelope of M. Then we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r, "\alpha^{'}"] \arrow[d, equal] & A' \arrow[r, "\beta^{'}"] \arrow[d, shift left, "f"] & L' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & A \arrow[r, "\beta"] \arrow[u, shift left, "g"] & L \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

It is easy to see that $A = f(A') \oplus \ker(g)$. We claim that $\ker(g) = 0$. Since $M = f\alpha^{'}(M) \subseteq f(A')$, $\ker(g) \cap M = 0$. We define the following homomorphism $\psi \colon A/(M \oplus \ker(g)) \to L'$, $a + (M \oplus \ker(g)) \mapsto \alpha^{'} g(a)$. Obviously, ψ is well defined. By diagram chasing, we see that ψ is injective. But both g and $\beta^{'}$ are surjective, so is ψ. Therefore, $\ker(g)$ is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective essential extension of $A/\ker(g)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that A is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective essential extension of M. This implies that $\ker(g) = 0$ and so f is an isomorphism. $\square$

6. $\mathcal{X}$-INJECTIVE COVER

In this section, we assume $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all pure projective modules and we prove that all modules have $\mathcal{X}$-injective covers.

Proposition 6.1. *The class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ of all $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules is closed under pure submodules.*

Proof. Let A be a pure submodule of an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module M. Then there is a pure exact sequence $0 \to A \to M \to M/A \to 0$ and a functor $Hom_R(X,-)$ preseves this sequence is exact whenever $X \in \mathcal{X}$. This implies that the sequence $0 \to Hom_R(X,A) \to Hom_R(X,M) \to Hom_R(X,M/A) \to Ext^1_R(X,A) \to 0$ is also exact for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. It follows that $Ext^1_R(X,A) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$, as desired. $\square$

Theorem 6.2. *Every R-module has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective preenvelope.*

Proof. Let M be an R-module. By [9, Lemma 5.3.12], there is a cardinal number $\aleph_\alpha$ such that for any R-homomorphism $\phi\colon M \to G$ with G an $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module, there exists a pure submodule A of G such that $|A| \leq \aleph_\alpha$ and $\phi(M) \subset A$. Clearly, $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under direct products and by Proposition 6.1 A is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Hence the theorem follows by [9, Proposition 6.2.1]. $\square$

Proposition 6.3. *The class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ of all $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules is injectively resolving.*

Proof. Let $0 \to M_1 \overset{\phi}{\to} M_2 \overset{\psi}{\to} M_3 \to 0$ be an exact sequence of left R-modules with $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Let $G \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. By Theorem 6.2, every module has a $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-preenvelope. By [23, Lemma 1.9], G has a special $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-preenvelope. By [13, Lemma 2.2.6], G has a special $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-precover. Then there exists an exact sequence $0 \to K \to A \to G \to 0$ with $A \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ and $K \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. We prove that M_3 is $\mathcal{X}$-injection, i.e., to prove that $Ext^1_R(G, M_3) = 0$. For this it suffices to extend any $\alpha \in Hom_R(K, M_3)$ to an element of $Hom_R(A, M_3)$. Clearly, K has $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$-precover,

$$0 \to K' \overset{f}{\to} A' \overset{g}{\to} K \to 0,$$

where K, $K^{'} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $A' \in \widetilde{\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}}$. As the class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under extensions, $A' \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Since $\alpha \circ g\colon A' \to M_3$ with $A^{'} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and M_1 an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module, then there exists $\beta\colon A' \to M_2$ such that $\psi \circ \beta = \alpha \circ g$. That is, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A' \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "\beta"] & K \arrow[d, "\alpha"] \\
M_2 \arrow[r, "\psi"] & M_3.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Now, we define $\beta \restriction_{\operatorname{im}\phi}\colon A' \to \operatorname{im}\phi$, where $\restriction$ is a restriction map. Then there exists $\gamma\colon K' \to M_1$ such that $\beta \restriction_{\operatorname{im}\phi} (f(K')) = \phi\gamma(K')$. Hence we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & K' \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, dashed, "\gamma"] & A' \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "\beta"] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\alpha"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & M_1 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & M_2 \arrow[r, "\psi"] & M_3 \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The $\mathcal{X}$-injectivity of M_1 yields a homomorphism $\gamma_1\colon A' \to M_1$ such that $\gamma = \gamma_1 \circ f$. So for each $k' \in K'$, we get $(\beta \circ f)(k') = (\phi \circ \gamma)(k') = (\phi \circ (\gamma_1 \circ f))(k')$. Then there exists a map $\beta_1 \in Hom_R(K, M_2)$ such that $\beta = \beta_1 \circ g$ and we get $\alpha = \psi \circ \beta_1$. Thus the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & K' \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, dashed, "\gamma"'] & A' \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[dl, dashed, "\gamma_1"'] \arrow[d, dashed, "\beta"'] & K \arrow[r] \arrow[dl, dashed, "\beta_1"'] \arrow[d, "\alpha"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & M_1 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & M_2 \arrow[r, "\psi"] & M_3 \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since M_2 is $\mathcal{X}$-injective, there exists $\rho \in Hom_R(A, M_2)$ such that $\beta_1 = \rho \circ f$. Thus $\alpha = \psi \circ \beta_1 = \psi \circ (\rho \circ f)$, where $\psi \circ \rho \in Hom_R(A, M_3)$. Hence M_3 is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. $\square$

Proposition 6.4. *The class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is injectively resolving if and only if for every pure submodule A of M, M/A is also $\mathcal{X}$-injective.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is injectively resolving. Let $M \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and A be a pure submodule of M. By Proposition 6.1, A is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. From the short exact sequence $0 \to A \to M \to M/A \to 0$, we get M/A is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Conversely, assume that for every $M \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and every pure submodule A of M, M/A is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Let $0 \to M_1 \xrightarrow{f} M_2 \to M_3 \to 0$ be an exact sequence of R-modules with $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. By the $\mathcal{X}$-injectivity of M_1, we get $\operatorname{im} f \subset M_2$ is also $\mathcal{X}$-injective. Thus $\operatorname{im} f$ is pure in M_2. By assumption, $M_2/\operatorname{im} f \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Since $M_2/\operatorname{im} f \cong M_3$, $M_3 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is injectively resolving since $\mathcal{I}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. $\square$

We recall that R is Noetherian if and only if every direct sum of injective R-modules is injective [9, Theorem 3.1.17].

The following result establishes an analog version of Theorem 2.6 in [18].

Theorem 6.5. *Let R be a Noetherian ring. Then every R-module M has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective precover.*

Proof. Let X be a set with $Card(X) \leq \kappa$, where κ is the cardinal in [3, Theorem 5]. Denote $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the power set of X. We find all the binary operations $*\colon G \times G \to G$ for each element $G \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and we get a new collection $\cup_{G \in \mathcal{P}(X)} \{G, *\} = \overline{\mathcal{G}}'$. From $\overline{\mathcal{G}}'$, find all the scalar multiplications, which are functions from the cross product into itself. This remains a set $\cup_{G \in \mathcal{P}(X)} \{(G, *, \cdot)\}$ which is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$. Some collection of members of $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ form a module and we can get the class $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules which is contained in the class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Clearly $\mathcal{I}_0$ is contained in the class $\mathcal{G}$. Since R is Noetherian, $\bigoplus_{N \in \mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))}$ is an injective module and hence it is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. We prove that $\bigoplus_{N \in \mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))} \xrightarrow{\phi} M$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective precover. That is, to show that if for any homomorphism $N' \to M$ with $N' \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$, then that the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N' \arrow[d, dashed] \arrow[dr] & \\
\bigoplus\limits_{N \in \mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))} \arrow[r] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

Let K be the kernel of the map $N' \to M$, where N' is sufficiently large. Then N'/K is sufficiently small since $|N'/K| \leq |M|$. By Bashir's Theorem [3], K has a nonzero submodule L that is pure in N'. Therefore L is $\mathcal{X}$-injective by Proposition 6.1. This implies that N'/L is $\mathcal{X}$-injective by Proposition 6.4. If N'/L is still sufficiently large, then repeat the process from the map $N'/L \to M$. Since N'/K_1 is sufficiently small, K_1/L has a nonzero submodule L_1/K_1 that is pure in N'/L. Thus $(N'/K_1)/(L_1/K_1) = N'/L_1$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. But again, this may be too large. Then by continuing this process we get $\varinjlim (N'/L_i)$ is $\mathcal{X}$-injective since $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under direct limits and it is sufficiently small, namely $\left|\varinjlim (N'/L_i)\right| \leq \kappa$. Then the map $N' \to M$ can be factored through an $\mathcal{X}$-injective module $\varinjlim (N'/L_i)$. Let $f \in Hom_R(\varinjlim (N'/L_i), M)$. We define a map $\overline{f}\colon \varinjlim (N'/L_i) \to \bigoplus N^{(Hom_R(N,M))}$ such that $\overline{f}(n' + L') = (n_f, 0, 0, \cdots)$, with $n_f = n$. Clearly, $\overline{f}$ is a linear map. Then the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \varinjlim N'/L_i \arrow[dl, dashed] \arrow[d, "f"] \\
\bigoplus\limits_{N\in\mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))} \arrow[r, "\phi"] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Hence we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & N' \arrow[ddl, dashed] \arrow[d] \arrow[ddr] & \\
 & \varinjlim N'/L_i \arrow[dr, "f"] & \\
\bigoplus\limits_{N\in\mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))} \arrow[rr, "\phi"'] & & M.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus, $\bigoplus\limits_{N\in\mathcal{I}_0} N^{(Hom_R(N,M))} \xrightarrow{\phi} M$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-injective precover. ☐

Proposition 6.6. *Let R be a Noetherian ring. Then the class of all $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules is closed under direct limits.*

Proof. Let $(U_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in \Lambda)$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{X}$-injective modules over directed index set Λ and canonical maps $\phi_\alpha\colon U_\alpha \to U$, where $U = \varinjlim_{\alpha\in\Lambda} U_\alpha$. For every $\mathcal{X}$-injective R-module G, there exists a short exact sequence $0 \to K \to P \to G \to 0$ with P a projective module, which induces an exact sequence $Hom_R(P,U) \to Hom_R(K,U) \to Ext^1_R(G,U) \to 0$. We show that U is $\mathcal{X}$-injective. We need only to show that $Hom_R(P,U) \to Hom_R(K,U)$ is surjective. Let $\beta \in Hom_R(K,U)$. By Proposition 4.8, K is $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$-projective. Thus β factors through some U_α. Then there is a map $\phi_\alpha \in Hom_R(U_\alpha, U)$ such that $\beta = \phi_\alpha\beta_\alpha$. Since $Ext^1_R(G, U_\alpha) = 0$, $Hom_R(P, U_\alpha) \to Hom_R(K, U_\alpha)$ is surjective. Then there exists $\overline{\beta_\alpha} \in Hom_R(P, U_\alpha)$ such that $\beta_\alpha = \overline{\beta_\alpha} g$. Hence $\phi_\alpha\overline{\beta_\alpha}$ is the required preimage of β. ☐

The following Theorem follows from Theorem 6.5 and Proposition 6.6.

Theorem 6.7. *Let R be a Noetherian ring. Then every R-module has an $\mathcal{X}$-injective cover.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author was partially supported by University Grant Commission, New Delhi, INDIA Project grant No. 41-773/2012(SR). The second and the third authors were supported by University Grant Commission, New Delhi, INDIA Non SAP BSR grant No. 11 - 105/2008(BSR) and grant No. 4-1/2008(BSR).

REFERENCES

[1] F. W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York 1992.

[2] M. Auslander and S. O. Smalø, Preprojective modules over artin algebras, *J. Algebra*, 66 (1980), 61-122.

[3] I. Bican, R. El Bashir, and E. E. Enochs, All modules have flat covers, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 33 (2001), 385-390.

[4] H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological Algebra*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. 1956.

[5] J. L. Chen, P-projective modules, *Comm. Algebra*, 24 (1996), 821-831.

[6] N. Q. Ding, On envelopes with the unique mapping property, *Comm. Algebra*, 24(4), (1996), 1459-1470.

[7] P. C. Eklof and J. Trlifaj, How to make *Ext* vanish, *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 33, (2001), 41-51.

[8] E. E. Enochs, injective and flat covers, envelopes and resolvents, *Isrel J. Math.*, 39 (1981), 189-209.

[9] E. E. Enochs and O. M. G. Jenda, *Relative Homological Algebra*, de Gruyter Exp. Math., Vol. 30, Walter de Gruyter: Berlin-New York, 2000.

[10] E. E. Enochs and J. A. Lopez-Ramos, Kaplansky Classes, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 107 (2002), 67-79.

[11] D. J. Fieldhouse, Character modules, dimension and purity, *Glasg. Math. J.*, 13 (1972), 144-146.

[12] L. Fuchs and L. Salce. *Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Volume 84, 2001.

[13] R. Göbel and J. Trlifaj, *Approximations and Endomorphisms Algebras of Modules*, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2000.

[14] R. E. Johnson and E. T. Wong, Self-injective Rings, *Can. Math. Bull.*, 2 (1959), 167-173.

[15] T. Y. Lam, *A first course in Non Commutative Rings*, GTM, Springer-Verlag, New york, 2001.

[16] L. Mao and N. Q. Ding, $\mathcal{L}$-injective hulls of modules, *Bull. Aus. Math. Soc.*, 74 (2006), 37-44.

[17] L. Mao and N. Q. Ding, FI-injective and FI-flat modules, *J. Algebra*, 309 (2007), 367-385.

[18] K. Pinzon, Absolutely pure covers, *Comm. Algebra* 36(6), (2008), 2186-2194.

[19] G. Puninski and P. Rothmaler, Pure projective modules, *J. London Math. Soc.*, (2) 71 (2005), 304-320.

[20] J. J. Rotman, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Academic Press, New York 1979.

[21] L. Salce, *Cotorsion theories for abelian groups*, ¡¡Symposia Mathematica¿¿ Vol. XXIII, pp. 11-32, Academic Press, London - New York (1979).

[22] B. Stenström, Coherent Rings and FP-injective modules, *J. London Math. Soc.*, 2 (1970), 323-329.

[23] J. Trlifaj, *Infinite dimensional tilting modules and cotorsion pairs, Hand book of tilting theory,* Lect. Notes 332, London Math. Soc., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 2007, pp 279-321.

[24] J. Xu, *Flat covers of Modules*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Vol 1634 Springer-Verlag, Germany, 1996.